## PCHB 80-183

1 2	SHORELINES HEA	RE THE RINGS BOARD AND DL HEARINGS BOARD
3		WASHINGTON
4	IN THE MATTER OF SUBSTANTIAL DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS,	
5	SAVE PORT SUSAN COMMITTEE,	
6	Appellant,	SHB No. 82-38
7	v.	ECPA 14
ل د	STATE OF WASHINGTON,	
9	DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY AND SEA HARVEST CORPORATION,	ORDER ON MOTIONS
10	Respondents.	)   
11	SEA HARVEST CORPORATION,	
12	Appellant,	) }
13	v.	SHB No. 82-39
15	SNOHOMISH COUNTY,	
_	Respondent,	
16	SAVE PORT SUSAN COMMITTEE,	
17	Intervenor.	
18		

÷	ISLAND COUNTY,	)
2	Appellant,	) )
3	v.	) SHB No. 82-40
<b>4</b> 5	STATE OF WASHINGTON, DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY AND SEA HARVEST CORPORATION,	) ) )
6	Respondents,	) )
7	SAVE PORT SUSAN COMMITTEE	) )
8	Intervenor.	) ) ) ECPA 14
9	ORN UNDUREM CORDORATION	
10	SEA HARVEST CORPORATION,	)
11	Appellant,	) ) ) SHB No. 83-3
12	V.	) Snb NO. 83-3
10	ISLAND COUNTY,	)
14	Respondent,	)
15	SAVE PORT SUSAN COMMITTEE,	) )
16	Intervenor.	) )
17	and	
18	SEA HARVEST CORPORATION,	)
19	Appellant,	
20	v.	PCHB No. 82-183
21 22	STATE OF WASHINGTON, DEPARTMENT OF GAME,	)
23	Respondent,	) )
24	SAVE PORT SUSAN COMMITTEE,	) )
25	Intervenor.	) ) )
27	ORDER ON MOTIONS SHB Nos. 82-38, -39, -40, 83-3 & PCHB No. 82-183: ECPA 14	-2-

Motions came for hearing before the Shorelines Hearings Board Ţ (Gayle Rothrock, Lawrence Faulk, Art O'Neal, Nancy Burnett and Rodney 2 Kerlsake) on February 15, 1983 in Lacey. Respondent Department of 3 Ecology (DOE) was represented by Charles W. Lean, Assistant Attorney 4 General; Island County was represented by Alan R. Hancock, Deputy 5 Prosecuting Attorney; Snohomish County was represented by Gordon W. 6 Sivley, Deputy Prosecuting Attorney; Sea Harvest Corporation was 7 represented by its attorney John E. Woodring; Save Port Susan 8 Committee was represented by its attorney, Joel M. Gordon; Department 9 of Game was represented by D. Anthony Weeks, Assistant Attorney 10 General. 11

Having considered the motions, affidavits, contentions, and the files and records herein, the Board rules as follows:

- 1. All cases: Save Port Susan Committee's Motion to Intervene is granted. The pleadings filed in SHB No. 82-38 shall be accepted as its pleading in intervention.
- 2. PCHB No. 82-183: By stipulation between the original parties, the case will be dismissed by separate order.
- 3. SHB No. 82-38: Sea Harvest's Motion to Dismiss for lack of jurisdiction is denied. However, Save Port Susan Committee's request for review is dismissed for the reasons set forth in SHB No. 82-40. As a practical matter, the consolidation of the cases and Save Port Susan Committee's intervention in the other pending cases leaves the issues raised in this matter for future resolution.

25

12

1 2

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

ORDER ON MOTIONS
SHB Nos. 82-38, -39, -40, 83-3
& PCHB No. 82-183: ECPA 14

2 3

5.

question should not be applied retroactively.

SHB No. 82-39: Snohomish County's Motion for Summary Judgment

Sea Harvest's Motion for Summary Judgment on the grounds that it

possesses an unconditional shoreline substantial development permit by

retroactive application of the 1982 amendments to chapter 90.62 RCW is

denied. While the distinction between procedure and substance in the

the amendment affects substantive rights. Therefore, the amendment in

SHB No. 82-40: Island County's Motion for Summary Judgment on

particular application of the amendment is not clear, the effect of

inapplicable to Sea Harvest's shoreline development application is

granted for the reason previously stated. Sea Harvest's cross motion

the ground that the 1982 amendments to chapter 90.62 RCW are

for summary judgment is denied. This file is closed.

on the grounds of res judicata/collateral estoppel is denied.

are genuine issues of material facts which are in dispute.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

12

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

 $23^{\circ}$ 

24

25

27

ORDER ON MOTIONS SHB Nos. 82-38, -39, -40, 83-3& PCHB No. 82-183: ECPA 14

-4-

-	6. SHB No. 83-3: Island County's Motion for Summary Judgment on
2	the grounds of res judicata/collateral estoppel is denied for reasons
3	previously stated. Sea Harvest's Motion for Summary Judgment on the
4	grounds of improper forum and retroactive effect of the 1982
5	amendments is denied.
6	DATED this 2 day of March, 1983.
7	SHORELINES HEARINGS BOARD
8	·
9	David alean
10	DAVID AKANA, Lawyer Member
11	
12	Payle Rothrock  BAYLE/ROTHROCK, Chairman
12	
14	Junganch
15	LAWRENCE & FAULK, Member
16	$\mathcal{L}: \mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{O}'\mathcal{H}_{a}$
17	RICHARD A. O'NEAL, Member
18	$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L} = $
19	Many 9. Dunett
20	NANCY R. BURNETT, Member
21	21 h -7/11
22	RODNEY M. KERSLAKE, Member
23 24	
25	
20	